

## Definitions for Satisfactory Progress and Significant Improvement for PLA Schools

	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	How Determined / Notes
<b>LEADING INDICATORS</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>Weighted average of below indicators</b>
Minutes in school year					Increasing goal each year, with a target of up to 300 additional hrs/yr
Assessment participation rate					Target of 100% in regular assessment efforts in each subject
Dropout (mobility) rate					Depends on K-8 or high school, use CEPI mobility info, determined by school
Student attendance rate					Based on state avg as target; determined by school
Students completing advanced work		Target: 4 of 8 indicators yellow	Target: 6 of 8 indicators yellow, 2+ green	Target: 7 of 8 indicators yellow; 4+ green	Based on state avg as target; determined by school
Discipline incidents					Rate of decrease and/or low average; determined by school
Course completion and retention					Level and improvement of retention and completion rates for all core subjects
Teacher performance using eval system					Rate of improvement over each year for teachers; determined by school
Teacher attendance rate					Improvement toward school goal, based on state avg and Beating the Odds rates
<b>IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS*</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>Weighted average of below indicators</b>
Build leadership capacity					Semester review of capacity
Teacher/leader evaluation process					Semester review of process
Educator reward and removal processes					Periodic review of process and decisions
Professional learning for staff		Each category has weighted points based on ability to monitor and importance in reform	Satisfactory implementation level grows in years 2 and 3	By start of year 3, all indicator areas should be yellow or green	Periodic review of activities, goals, and data
Recruitment and retention of staff					Semester review of process and outcomes
Data use to guide instructional programs					Semester review of process and outcomes
Quality instruction and differentiation					Monthly review of classroom instruction
Increased learning time					Periodic review of schedule and classroom instruction'
Family and community engagement					Periodic review of events and communication
Operational flexibility					Semester review of process and outcomes
Technical assistance					Semester review of process and outcomes
<b>LAGGING INDICATORS</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>Weighted average of below indicators</b>
% Students in each proficiency level					Targets identified by each school based on percentile improvement
Average scale scores					Growth of average scale scores on all assessments in all subjects
% ELL who attain English proficiency		Must gather data even if not counted to see growth rates in years 2 and 3			Progress on language proficiency assessment for all ELL students
Graduation rate					Growth rate set by school based on state average and Beating the Odds rates
College enrollment rate					Both general enrollment and "1 year in" enrollment included
Improvement on leading indicators					Continued growth in leading indicators
<b>STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT</b>	<b>On PLA</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>Determined using student achievement and other data</b>
All Students	List				All data collected annually and processed by BAA
Subgroups, including race/ethnicity					School target rates are determined for each school based on provisions established by MDE focusing on "reasonable" improvement. This may vary pending future federal decisions. Current targets are for PLA schools to achieve a minimum improvement at the 80th percentile in all subjects each year.
Limited English Proficient					
Students with Disabilities					
Economically Disadvantaged					

\*Implementation indicators shown reflect transformation model requirements - slightly different for turnaround model

Red = less than 40% of expectations on implementation indicators      Yellow = 40-80% of expectations on implementation indicators      Green = over 80% of expectations

## Information about Definitions and Indicators of Satisfactory Improvement

The table on the following page provides details about the various indicators that will be used to make decisions about the satisfactory progress of schools that are being monitored by the School Reform/Redesign Office (SRO). This table lists the types of indicators of progress that will be used by the SRO to evaluate progress during the course of the transformation or turnaround effort that the school is required to perform in accordance with MCL 380.1280c. We know that turnaround efforts to improve student achievement take time to implement in an effective and sustainable manner. As a result, these indicators are weighted at different levels for each year of the reform plan implementation process. The weighting of these factors results in an overall score for progress that will be determined three times per year. This score will be used by the School Reform Officer to make recommendations to the State Superintendent about the future of the school.

In addition, schools being monitored by the SRO must accomplish additional benchmarks as established by the SRO office. Schools must progress on a growing number of benchmarks each year, as reflected in the table on the previous page. In general, schools should be making satisfactory progress on at least half of the categories of leading and implementation indicators in year one of implementation of the plan, and at least 3/4 of the categories by the end of year two. These will be noted on the progress reports provided to each school based on monitoring efforts by the Michigan Department of Education.

Student achievement (as noted through standardized assessment tools) are also a critical indicator of progress. The requirements for this are currently in flux, and so we will note any changes to the specific target outcomes expected of schools during or after the 2012-13 school year. Currently, schools will have individual benchmarks based on current performance, and must make proficiency gains (improvement) in all subjects at a level of the 80th percentile or higher in improvement each year as they implement the three-year reform plan. During those three years, decision points will occur in January and June based on implementation indicators, and again in August based on the school's AYP status and/or student achievement indicators.

At each point, the SRO will recommend one of three actions based on the sum result of all of these indicators:

1. Continuation of plan implementation with SRO oversight
2. Transfer of the school back to full oversight by the home school district.
3. Transfer of the school to the Education Achievement System, which oversight by the Education Achievement Authority. The school will not be eligible for local district control until at least five years from transfer.

These decisions are subject to the discretion of the State Superintendent and School Reform Officer. While the weighted score and progress benchmarks provide general guidance for such decisions, other factors or situations unique to each school may affect progress on all of the areas required. The State Superintendent and School Reform Officer reserve the right to include other considerations in such crucial decisions for a school and its students, staff, and community.